

1
2 Appellant works in Architectural Engineering and Construction Services located on the WSU
3 campus. During the time period of his review, Appellant performed work in several skilled trades
4 but his work was predominately plumbing. As stated in Appellant's Position Questionnaire and
5 confirmed by Appellant during the hearing before the Board, 58% of his duties fit within the PPS
6 classification.

7
8 **Summary of Appellant's Arguments.** Appellant argues that his duties and responsibilities fluctuate
9 throughout the year and that limiting the review of his position to six months does not provide a full
10 assessment of his position. Appellant also argues that WSU erred when it limited its review of the
11 Maintenance Mechanic classifications to the second level of the series. Appellant argues that WSU
12 should have considered the third level. Appellant disagrees with the distinguishing characteristics of
13 the CAMPS classification and asserts that the classification excludes his position on the basis of
14 location of work which treats him and other staff located at the WSU campus unfairly. Appellant
15 asserts that he performs plumbing and steam fitting 58% of the time and ironwork 35% of the time.
16 Therefore, in viewing his work in totality, the determination should have found that 93% of his time
17 is spent performing work in two skilled trades as required for allocation to Maintenance Mechanic
18 series and the CAMPS classes. Appellant further asserts that overall, his duties and responsibilities
19 include work in a total of five skilled trades. Appellant contends that he performs work in multiple
20 skilled trades for significant amounts of time in new construction as the CAMPS definition requires
21 and that on a best fit basis, his position should be reallocated.

22
23 **Summary of Respondent's Arguments.** Respondent argues that the majority of Appellant's duties
24 and responsibilities fall within the PPS classification. Respondent asserts that the work he performs
25 is primarily on the WSU main campus. Because he is not performing work in new construction 35%
26 of the time in an off-campus research or extension unit, Respondent contends that his position does
27 not fit within the CAMPS classification. WSU explains that the Maintenance Mechanic 2 and 3
28 classes were considered. However, WSU argues that Appellant's work falls primarily in the PPS
29 class and related duties; therefore, his position best fits within the PPS classification. Respondent

1 further explains that in regard to the Maintenance Mechanic 3 level, Appellant did not perform
2 duties as a senior, specialist or lead worker. Respondent asserts that based on a review of all the
3 materials provided by Appellant, the primary functions of his position and the majority of his work
4 fit within the PPS classification.

5
6 **Primary Issue.** Whether the director's determination that Appellant's position is properly allocated
7 to the Plumber/Pipefitter/Steamfitter classification should be affirmed.

8
9 **Relevant Classifications.** Plumber/Pipefitter/Steamfitter, class code 621F; Maintenance Mechanic
10 series, including Maintenance Mechanic 2, class code 626K, and Maintenance Mechanic 3, class
11 code 626L; and Construction and Maintenance Project Specialist, class code 627E.

12
13 **Decision of the Board.** The purpose of a position review is to determine which classification best
14 describes the overall duties and responsibilities of a position. A position review is neither a
15 measurement of the volume of work performed, nor an evaluation of the expertise with which that
16 work is performed. A position review is a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of a
17 particular position to the available classification specifications. This review results in a
18 determination of the class that best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the position.
19 See Liddle-Stamper v. Washington State University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).

20
21 Appellant is multi-skilled in a variety of trades. In addition, WSU acknowledges that he performs
22 work in more than one area. Based on the evidence before the Board, Appellant is a conscientious
23 and dedicated employee. However, allocation is not based on a person's abilities or level of
24 performance. Rather, allocation is based on the overall duties and responsibilities of a position.

25
26 Appellant argues that the language in the CAMPS classification unfairly excludes him from
27 allocation to that class. The allocation process is not the proper forum to address modification of
28 the requirements of existing class or creation of a new classification. Furthermore, the
29 modification or creation of classifications is not within this Board's jurisdiction.

1
2 The distinguishing characteristics for the CAMPS class state, in relevant part: “. . . [i]n higher
3 education, this class is distinguished from the Maintenance Mechanic class series by the requirement
4 to perform work in at least two skilled trades areas in new construction at least thirty-five percent of
5 the working time in an off-campus research and extension unit where access to campus skilled trades
6 shops/employees is limited by significant geographical distances. Positions fabricate apparatus,
7 facilities, or systems unique to research studies.”

8
9 Appellant’s position is located on the main campus of WSU in Pullman, Washington. His position is
10 not located at an off-campus research or extension unit. His position does not fit within the CAMPS
11 classification.

12
13 The class series concept for the Maintenance Mechanic series states: “[p]ositions in this series
14 perform general maintenance, repair, remodeling and construction duties utilizing working
15 knowledge of several related skill fields such as electrical, plumbing, carpentry, welding, painting
16 and machinist work. Incumbents inspect, repair, install and maintain physical facilities, locks and
17 maintain and repair machinery and equipment. Positions may be required to lead or supervise and
18 instruct offenders, inmates or residents in general maintenance activities.”

19
20 The Maintenance Mechanic series is a general series that encompasses positions that use multiple
21 skills to perform work in a variety of disciplines. This series is not intended to include positions
22 that perform work predominately in one skilled trade.

23
24 Appellant asks that his position be reallocated to the CAMPS or the Maintenance Mechanic 3
25 class on a best fit basis. The best fit concept is used when for lack of a better fit, the duties and
26 responsibilities of a position do not encompass the full breadth of the duties and responsibilities
27 described by the classification but the classification best describes the level, scope and diversity of
28 the overall duties and responsibilities of the position. See for example, Salsberry v. Washington
29 State Parks and Recreation Commission, PRB Case No. R-ALLO-06-013 (2007) and Allegrì v.

1 Washington State University, PAB Case No. ALLO-96-0026 (1998). However, application of the
2 best fit concept is not appropriate when there is a class that specifically includes the majority of
3 the overall duties, the scope, the diversity and the level of responsibility of a position.

4
5 When there is a class that specifically includes a particular assignment and there is a general
6 classification that has a definition which could also apply to the position, the position should be
7 allocated to the class that specifically includes the position. Mikitik v. Dept's of Wildlife and
8 Personnel, PAB No. A88-021 (1989); see also, Waldher v. Dept. of Transportation, PRB Case No.
9 R-ALLO-08-026 (2009).

10
11 The definition for the Plumber/Pipefitter/Steamfitter class states: “[p]erforms skilled plumbing
12 and/or steamfitting work.”

13
14 In this case, the documentary evidence and Appellant’s argument before the Board confirm that the
15 majority of his duties and responsibilities involve plumbing, pipefitting, steam fitting and related
16 activities. Therefore, the majority of his work falls within the PPS classification.

17
18 In a hearing on exceptions, the Appellant has the burden of proof. WAC 357-52-110. Appellant has
19 failed to meet his burden of proof.

20 **ORDER**

21 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by Neal Wallen is
22 denied and the director’s determination dated June 23, 2009, is affirmed and adopted.

23 DATED this ____ day of _____, 2009.

24 WASHINGTON PERSONNEL RESOURCES BOARD

25
26 _____
LAURA ANDERSON, Vice Chair

27
28 _____
DJ MARK, Member